## Case 2:24-cv-01841-DAD-JDP Document 29 Filed 05/30/25 Page 2 of 3

and now wants to file a second amended complaint. *Id.* Having considered the record and applicable law, I recommend that plaintiff's motion to reopen be denied.

Under Rule 60(b), the court may grant reconsideration of a final judgment and any order based on: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence which, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered within ten days of entry of judgment; and (3) fraud, misrepresentation, or misconduct of an opposing party. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1)-(3). A motion for reconsideration on any of these grounds must be brought within one year of entry of judgment or the order being challenged. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1). Under Rule 60(b), the court may also grant reconsideration if: (1) the judgment is void; (2) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged, an earlier judgment has been reversed or vacated, or applying the judgment prospectively is no longer equitable; and (3) any other reason that justifies relief. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4)-(6). A motion for reconsideration on any of these grounds must be brought "within a reasonable time." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1).

Plaintiff has identified no authority providing a basis for reopening this case, and I know of none. His motion fails to present newly discovered evidence that would change the outcome of the court's ruling, fails to show that the court committed clear error, and fails to establish fraud, misrepresentation, or misconduct of either the opposing party or this court. The interests of finality and the conservation of judicial resources also do not warrant the use of the extraordinary remedy plaintiff seeks. *See United States v. Alpine Land & Reservoir Co.*, 984 F.2d 1047, 1049 (9th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, plaintiff has failed to establish any basis for relief under Rule 60(b) from the court's dismissal order and judgment, and I recommend that his motion be denied.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is directed to assign a district judge to this action.

It is also RECOMMENDED that plaintiff's motion to reopen, ECF No. 28, be DENIED.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days of service of these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Any such document should be captioned "Objections to

	Case 2:24-cv-01841-DAD-JDP Document 29 Filed 05/30/25 Page 3 of 3
1	Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations," and any response shall be served and filed
2	within fourteen days of service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file
3	objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Se
4	Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir.
5	1991).
6	
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	Dated: May 30, 2025
9	JERÉMY D. PETERSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	UNITED STATES WAGISTRATE JUDGE
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	